

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

**DIVISION TWO**

In re MIRANDA E., a Person Coming  
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY DEPARTMENT  
OF PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

TERESA E.,

Defendant and Appellant.

E040042

(Super.Ct.No. INJ16482)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Christopher J. Sheldon,  
Judge. Affirmed.

Lisa A. DiGrazia, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and  
Appellant.

No appearance by Plaintiff and Respondent.

No appearance by Minor.

Appellant Teresa E. (mother) appeals from the juvenile court's order terminating her parental rights as to her daughter, M. (the child). We find no errors, and we affirm.

In November 2004, mother gave birth to a baby boy (the child's brother). Both the baby and mother tested positive for amphetamines when the baby was born. The child, who was five years old at the time, was staying with the maternal grandmother. (She had been living with her for the past two years.) The child was detained, as the maternal grandmother stated that she had a criminal history. On November 15, 2004, the Department of Public Social Services filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 300<sup>1</sup> petition on behalf of the child and her brother, who is not a subject of this appeal. The petition alleged that the children were at risk of suffering harm because of the domestic violence and substance abuse histories of mother and father.<sup>2</sup> (§ 300, subd. (b).)

A jurisdiction/disposition hearing was held on December 9, 2004. The juvenile court declared the child and her brother dependent children of the court. The court also ordered reunification services for mother. The child was initially placed with the paternal grandmother but was then moved to foster care.

At the six-month status review hearing, the court offered mother six more months of reunification services. Mother entered an inpatient drug treatment program some time in October 2005, but she was discharged from the program the next month due to possible alcohol use.

---

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory references will be to the Welfare and Institutions Code, unless otherwise noted.

On November 1, 2005, the court held a 12-month status review hearing and terminated mother's reunification services. The section 366.26 hearing was set for March 1, 2006.

The social worker filed a section 366.26 report on February 16, 2006, recommending that mother's parental rights be terminated. The social worker reported that mother had not had any visits or contact with the child for about one year. A visit had been scheduled in November 2005; but since mother had been discharged from her inpatient program, the social worker felt concerned that mother's alcohol and drug use would cause visitation between mother and the child to be inappropriate. The last attempt to set up a visit was in January 2005. The child was upset with the idea of mother visiting and refused to attend the visit.

The child had been placed with the prospective adoptive parents for about 11 months at the time the section 366.26 report was filed. The social worker reported that the prospective adoptive parents had been meeting the child's emotional and physical needs. Furthermore, the child expressed that she wanted to stay with the family.

The section 366.26 hearing was held on March 1, 2006. The court read and considered the social worker's report. The court found that it was likely that the child would be adopted and terminated mother's parental rights.

Mother has appealed, and at her request, we appointed counsel to represent her. Counsel has filed a brief under authority of *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, *People*

---

[footnote continued from previous page]

<sup>2</sup> Father is not a party to this appeal.

*v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, setting forth a statement of the case and facts and asking this court to undertake an independent review of the entire record.

We provided mother with an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief. She has done so, and we have read and considered it.

Even though we are not required to conduct an independent review of the record under *In re Sade C.*, *supra*, 13 Cal.4th 952, we have done so. We have completed that review and find no arguable issues.

#### DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

/s/ Hollenhorst  
J.

We concur:

/s/ Ramirez  
P.J.

/s/ McKinster  
J.